

REMARKS

This is in response to the final Office Action of November 27, 2009. In the final Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 12 and 34-39 as being dependent on a rejected independent claim but otherwise would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims (see ¶ 20). Accordingly, Applicants have amended claims 12 and 34 to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Additionally, in the final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 6 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,697,464 to *Martin* under § 102(b) or alternatively § 103(a). Claims 8-9 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Martin*. Claims 7 and 10-11 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Martin* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,040,950 to *Dalquist, III et al.* Claim 5 was rejected as being unpatentable over *Martin* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,749,526 to *Laabs et al.* Claims 13-17 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Martin* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,757,162 to *Weber* and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,481,962 to *Teague*.

In response to the final Office Action, independent claim 1 has been amended to more clearly distinguish over the cited prior art and new claims 40-47 have been added. For at least the following reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the prior art does not teach or suggest the subject matter of the claims and that the pending claims are patentable.

Independent Claim 1

Without conceding the propriety of the Examiner's characterization of the *Martin*, *Dalquist*, *Laabs*, *Weber* and *Teague* references, Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art does not and cannot teach the pressure washer of claim 1, as presently amended.

As amended, claim 1 now recites that the "diagnostic circuit is comprised of a plurality of operation amplifiers to detect a plurality of voltage levels, wherein each of said plurality of

detected voltage levels corresponds to an operation condition.” In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that “Martin does not teach... operational amplifiers...” (§ 19, page 7). Moreover, the *Weber* reference does not teach the use of a plurality of operational amplifiers.

For at least these reasons, independent claim 1 is not anticipated or made obvious by *Martin* and/or *Weber*. Because dependent claims 2-11 and 13-16 depend from allowable independent claim 1 and add further limitations thereto, each of these claims also should be allowable.

New Claims 40-47

In addition, new claims 40-47 have been added, of which claims 40, 45 and 47 are independent. No new matter has been added with these claim, support for these claims, for example, may be found at paragraphs 27-30 of the application as filed.

Conclusion


Applicants note that the RCE fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(e) is being submitted with its Request for Continued Examination Transmittal (Form PTO/SB/30EFS). Previously, Applicants had paid for 4 independent claims and 31 total claims. After this amendment, a \$110 fee is due for an independent claim in addition to the four already paid for. No additional fees are otherwise believed to be due. However, if any additional fees are necessary, Applicants hereby authorize the Director to charge any underpayment of fees, or credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. 50-1039.

It is submitted that the above amendments place the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

COOK ALEX LTD.

Dated: February 16, 2010


David M. Thimmig

Registration No. 36,034

200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850

Chicago, Illinois 60606

(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568